# Management Control Evaluation Checklist
## Management – Administration of the Army Reimbursable Policy

| REGULATION NUMBER: | AR 5-9 |
|---|---|
| DATE OF REGULATION: | 16 Nov 98 |

**Assessable Unit : (Mailing address and phone number)**

**1. Function.** The function covered by this checklist is the administration Army reimbursable policy.

**2. Purpose.** The purpose of this checklist is to assist commanders and managers in evaluating the key management controls outlined below. It is not intended to cover all controls.

**3. Instructions.** Answers must be based on the actual testing of key management controls (for example, document analysis, direct observation, sampling, simulation, other). Answers that indicate deficiencies must be explained and corrective action indicated in supporting documentation. These key management controls must be formally evaluated at least once every 5 years. Certification that this evaluation has been conducted must be accomplished on the attached DA Form 11-2-R (Management Control Evaluation Certification Statement). DA Form 11-2-R will be locally reproduced on 8 1/2- by 11-inch paper. A copy for reproduction purposes is located at the back of this regulation.

**4. Supersession.** This checklist does not replace a previous checklist.

**5. Comments.** Help to make this a better tool for evaluating management controls. Submit comments to: Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (DAIM-MD), 600 Army Pentagon, Washington, DC 20310-0600.

| **Evaluation conducted by: (Name, Grade, Title, Office Branch, Telephone Number)** | **Date of Evaluation** |
|---|---|
| | |

**Evaluation Results:** (Document the evaluation results on DA Form 11-2-R, in item 7)

| REGULATION  NUMBER: | AR 5-9 |
|---|---|
| DATE OF REGULATION: | 16 Nov 98 |

| TEST QUESTIONS: | RESPONSE | | | TESTING APPROACH | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | YES | NO | N/A | Document Analysis | Direct Observation | Sampling | Simulation |
| a. Have the customer requirements been documented based on customer input? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b. Does the proposed standard level address and consider customer requirements? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c. Has customer feedback on the proposed standard level been addressed and considered? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| d. Are the proposed reimbursements based on allowable costs consistent with the intent of the ARP? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| e. In the case of a significant increase in the reimbursement level required for the same level of support, is the customer provided sufficient lead time to program and budget for the increase? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| f. In the case of a significant increase to the existing customer support requirements, a new customer, or a new support requirement, is the host installation or support provider provided sufficient lead time to program and budget for the increase? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |